

REMARKS

The Advisory Action dated August 2, 2006, has been received, and carefully reviewed by the Applicant.

By this amendment, claims 4 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Furthermore, antecedent basis for the terms "the predetermined pitch", "the grooves", "the first surface", and "the second surface" in claim 1 has been provided by appropriate amendment of claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejection as being unpatentable over claims 1, 18, 18, 19, 18, 18, 18, and 1, respectively, of U.S. 6,733,230 in view of Fujii and AAPA Figures 23-24. Claim 4 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejection as being unpatentable over claim 18 of U.S. 6,733,230 in view of Fujii and AAPA Figures 23-24, and further in view of Sakamoto. Claim 12 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejection as being unpatentable over claim 18 of U.S. 6,733,230 in view of Fujii and AAPA Figures 23-24, and further in view of Rollwage. Claims 14, 15, 17, 21, and 22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of

obviousness-type double patenting rejection as being unpatentable over claim 18 of U.S. 6,733,230 in view of Fujii and AAPA Figures 23-24, and further in view of Rollwage.

Claim 16 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejection as being unpatentable over claim 19 of U.S. 6,733,230 in view of Fujii, AAPA Figures 23-24, Rollwage, and further in view of Sakamoto.

Claims 4 and 16 have been canceled.

Favorable reconsideration of the remainder of the rejections based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is respectfully requested in the light of the attached Terminal Disclaimer.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant considers that this application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Furthermore, as provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.141, upon allowance of a generic claim, Applicant is entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of withdrawn claims 7-9 and 18-20 in this regard.

If any final points remain that can be clarified by telephone, Examiner Verdier is respectfully encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions the Commissioner for Patents to extend the time for reply to the notice dated April 7, 2006, for two (2) months from July 7, 2006, to September 7, 2006. A duly completed credit card authorization form is attached to effect payment of the extension fee.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Malcolm J. MacDonald
Malcolm J. MacDonald
Reg. No. 40,250
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 24

Date: September 1, 2006